DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 429 RC 015 924

AUTHOR Rochin, Refugio I.; de la Torre, Adela
TITLE The Current Status and Future of Chicano Studies Programs: Are They Academically Sound?
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association for Chicano Studies (14th, El Paso, TX, April 10-12, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); *Affirmative Action; *College Programs; Comparative Analysis; Educational Environment; Educational Opportunities; Educational Quality; *Enrollment Trends; *Ethnic Studies; Faculty Integration; Futures (of Society); Higher Education; *Program Content; Program Improvement; School Holding Power; School Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Chicano Studies; Mexican American Studies; *United States (Southwest)

ABSTRACT

Using survey responses and catalogue descriptions from 38 programs, the paper examines the current status of Chicano studies programs in four-year colleges/universities in the Southwest. Findings indicate many programs evolved from the civil rights legislation of the 1960s to address ethnic minority concerns and to offer curriculum in the humanities and social sciences but currently serve as a means for fulfilling Affirmative Action requirements and developing a community of Chicano scholars. Identified as problems affecting Chicano studies programs are low Chicano student enrollment, relatively poor student retention and completion of college degrees, paucity of Chicano faculty, and a negative environment for Affirmative Action. Most problems identified by Chicano respondents appear to revolve around the perception of little support for Affirmative Action. Most Chicano studies programs need and want more Chicano faculty and students on their campuses. With more faculty present, the possibility of attracting (increasing enrollment) and serving (increasing retention) more Chicano students improves. Key components of an ideal program, as identified by the survey, include, in order of importance, better campus Affirmative Action, more trained (Ph.D.) Chicano scholars, greater funding, more "activists" (politically involved Chicano students), good "educational" services, a positive public image, and strong community ties. A two-page list of references concludes the document. (NEC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED273429

# THE CURRENT STATUS AND FUTURE OF CHICANO STUDIES PROGRAMS: ARE THEY ACADEMICALLY SOUND*

by

Refugio I. Rochin
Associate Professor

and

Adela de la Torre
Postdoctoral Fellow

Department of Agricultural Economics
University of California
Davis, CA 95616

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Refugio I Rochin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

RC015924

*Paper presented at the 14th Annual Conference of the National Association for Chicano Studies, April 10-12, 1986, The University of Texas at El Paso.

## INTRODUCTION

This paper examines the current status of Chicano Studies Programs in four year colleges and universities of the Southwest. It is largely based upon an extensive program review and compilation of facts derived from our survey and catalogue descriptions of 38 programs. The study surveys program directors and faculty and attempts to corroborate or clarify the prevailing concerns affecting Chicano Studies. From this analysis we comment on the future of Chicano Studies and ways to improve current programs.

Historically, many of these programs evolved from the civil rights legislation of the sixties. Their main goal was to address ethnic minority concerns and to offer curriculum in the humanities and the social sciences.

Today, Chicano Studies does much more than teach courses. Chicano Studies serves as a means for fulfilling Affirmative Action requirements. Without Chicano Studies Programs, the Chicano faculty count would be sharply reduced on most campuses thereby diminishing campuswide Affirmative Action efforts. Also, Chicano Studies is concentrating more attention on developing a community of Chicano scholars. The emphasis is research and the products are articles destined for publications in traditional journals.

There are several problems affecting Chicano Studies. These include problems of low Chicano student enrollment, relatively poor student retention and completion of college degrees, a paucity of Chicano faculty, and the problem of a negative environment for Affirmative Action. This last point is critical as many non-minority faculty believe that Affirmative Action has been successful on their respective campuses. However, in the majority of cases, the net gainers of Affirmative Action have been White women, not minority faculty. Furthermore, campus sentiment concerning "reverse discrimination" is rising which acts to hinder the credibility of Affirmative Action Programs.

In our paper we further explore these problems and conditions which affect Chicano Studies Programs. The paper is presented in three parts. Part I provides factual overview of the major constraints affecting Chicano Studies. This is our general assessment of the major conditions facing Chicano Studies in higher education. We consider these to be the exogenous factors which few programs can deal with directly.

Part II provides data and analysis from our survey to understand the endogenous problems affecting the faculty and programs of Chicano Studies, primarily in California, but also from Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and Colorado. Our survey covered directors and faculty of 38 programs. We sought responses to two related questions: (1) what are the major issues and factors affecting Chicano Studies on your campus? and (2) regardless of your campus, what would be the characteristics of an ideal program? By asking about the "ideal" arrangement, we are able to offer some suggestions for the future of Chicano Studies.

Part III presents our summary and conclusions which should add to the ability of faculty to enhance Chicano Studies Programs on their respective campus.

## PART I. PREVAILING CONSTRAINTS

The academic environment and constraints which affect the nature of Chicano Studies are of critical importance. Four issues in particular appear to impinge upon its current role.

### a. Limited Minority/Chicano Enrollment

Despite many years of experimentation and debate over the merits of ethnic studies programs, relatively few minorities, in particular Blacks and Hispanics, become eligible for admission into the campuses where the programs are offered. Exacerbating the problem is data which reports a decline in the enrollment of Hispanics in higher education in the Southwest, the region with the largest population of Chicanos. According to the U.S. Department of Education's Center for Education Statistics, Hispanic enrollment increased from 1976 to 1982 and then declined in 1984 (see Table I). The decline in California is particularly troubling. Although California leads all other states with respect to Hispanic enrollment, in 1984, its Hispanic enrollment showed a tremendous drop, from 185,412 in 1982 to 158,423 in 1984. Hispanics represent the fastest growing population of all ethnic groups in the Southwest. Demographic data show a significant real increase in the number of Hispanics who are of a college-going age (Bouvier and Martin, 1985).

In California, when we compare the enrollment figures of different ethnic groups from ninth grade through high school, we see a rapidly declining percentage of minorities who are eligible for admission into the University of California or the California State Universities. For example, in Table II, 20.8 percent of all California ninth graders were listed as Hispanic in 1979. By, 1983, only 4.9 percent were eligible for enrollment in the University of California and only 10.4 percent for the CSU system. The same pattern is

evident for Blacks. Asian Americans, who hold the highest rates of college eligibility across all ethnic groups in California, are the major exception.

TABLE I

Hispanic Enrollment in Higher Education in the Southwest, 1976 to 1984

| | 1976 | 1978 | 1980 | 1982 | 1984 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| California | 144,413 | 147,986 | 167,677 | 185,412 | 158,423 |
| Texas | 71,648 | 78,510 | 85,551 | 90,095 | 104,017 |
| Arizona | 14,080 | 15,465 | 15,137 | 16,991 | 18,028 |
| New Mexico | 12,869 | 13,277 | 14,236 | 15,286 | 16,502 |
| Colorado | 8,995 | 8,981 | 9,078 | 9,487 | 8,734 |
| Total | 237,815 | 264,219 | 291,679 | 317,271 | 305,704 |

Source: U.S. Department of Education, Center for Statistics, Official Fall Enrollment, published in La Red/The Net, Newsletter of the National Chicano Council on Higher Education, Claremont, California, No. 98, July 1986, p. 2.

TABLE II

Relative Distribution of Ethnic Minorities in California Schools, 1979-1983[a]

| | Asian | Black | Hispanic | White |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Ninth Graders | 4.1 | 10.4 | 20.8 | 62.4 |
| High School Graduates | 6.3 | 9.1 | 18.1 | 64.0 |
| Eligible UC | 26.9 | 3.6 | 4.9 | 15.5 |
| Eligible only CSU | 22.1 | 6.5 | 10.4 | 18.0 |

[a]Percentage of ethnic/racial group of all California ninth graders in 1979-1980, percentage of all high school graduates in 1982-83, percentage eligible for Regular Admission to UC and only CSU for the Fall 1983.

Source: California Postsecondary Education Commission, Director's Report April 1985.

The fact of the matter is that the 4.9 percent Hispanic eligibility rate is well below the 13.2 percent U.C. eligibility rate for all California high school graduates. Hispanics, at 10.4 percent are also 5.4 percent below the

state average eligibility rate for the CSU system. In addition, unlike their Asian cohorts that have double the eligibility rates and have greater success in the educational pipeline, the Hispanic group experiences a narrowing pipeline of college eligibility.

Many educators attribute the low eligibility rates of Hispanics to the high drop out rates that occur during their high school years (Commission on Hispanic Underrepresentation, 1985, pp. 1-8). Others believe that the high drop out rates have earlier roots, resulting from the poor transition Hispanics experience from elementary to junior high school years. It is argued that study habits, interests, and attitudes toward schooling formed during the elementary school years largely shape subsequent success and failure.

In a recent report by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (1985), it was observed that the following factors affected Hispanics' enrollment in postsecondary education: their past academic achievement; their families income; their parents' education; the cost of attending particular institutions; and institutional selectivity in admissions. Given that many Hispanics are from relatively low income households, it is not surprising that educational cost is also a factor that is cited by CPEC as a cause of the low participation rates of Hispanics in higher education. The findings of a 1984 survey of a sample of 11,580 students of Cal State, indicated that on measures of socioeconomic status, a larger proportion of Chicano students (69 percent) came from low socioeconomic backgrounds than did Anglos (23 percent), Blacks (44 percent), Asians (23 percent) and "other Hispanic" students (40 percent). These results showed dramatic differences in educational level of the minority father or head of household, with the Chicano parents showing the lowest

levels of educational attainment (reported in: Commission on Hispanic Underrepresentation, 1985, p. 6).

Another recent study by the Rand Corporation on California Mexican immigration (1985) argues that the pre-college drop out rate of persons of Mexican descent, although high, is not as high for native-born Latinos. The Rand study estimated a 20 percent drop out rate for the native-born group.

> The high estimates reflect the educational achievement of the earlier cohorts and educational participation rates of the Mexican-born, who constitute a large proportion of the current Latino population in the state. When we assess the educational achievement of each generation and each immigrant group separately, we see that later cohorts and California-born Latinos are doing nearly as well as other Californians.

In addition to focusing on the intergenerational differences in educational achievement of Latinos, the Rand study pointed to the positive link between English proficiency and educational success.

One obvious policy conclusion from the above is the need to adapt educational programs to the low income status of the Hispanic student population. This would address Chicano retention in the primary schools. However, even with these suggestions, the low rates of participation of Hispanics in postsecondary education is still alarming. It would take several years of intensified efforts and public provisions to increase the eligibility rates of Hispanics. Nevertheless, the low eligibility rates would require Chicano Studies Programs to wait until actual Chicano student enrollments increased. With few students enrolled, it would be difficult to develop strong Chicano Studies Programs.

b. Poor Retention and Completion Rates

Compounding the problem of limited enrollment is the fact that Hispanics have relatively low rates of retention and completion of degrees from

postsecondary institutions. Despite college and university efforts to increase minority student participation through outreach, "special action admissions" and other student support programs, retention has become a critical issue affecting Chicano Studies. Table III provides an idea of the retention problem. It compares the enrollment of different ethnic groups as freshman in Fall 1979 with the graduates of 1983-84 from the University of California. While the total number of U.C. graduates surpassed the number enrolled as freshman, indicating the role of transfer from other colleges, the absolute numbers of Blacks, Chicanos, and Filipinos declined. On the other hand, the White/other and Asian groups showed the highest levels of graduation. From the time minority freshman were enrolled in 1979 to the year of graduation in 1983-84, there was a clear decline in the number of Chicano students in the University of California. These data are not an aberration of other periods either.

TABLE III

Flow of University of California Freshman Enrollment and Graduation, 1979-1984

| Ethnic Group | First Time Enrolled Freshman Fall, 1979 | Bachelors Degrees Conferred 1983-1984 | Absolute Change 1979-1984 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 17,194 | 21,371 | +4,177 |
| American Indian | 47 | 84 | +37 |
| Black | 708 | 522 | -186 |
| Chicano | 747 | 658 | -89 |
| Latino | 272 | 353 | +81 |
| Filipino | 279 | 251 | -28 |
| Asian | 2,216 | 2,681 | +465 |
| White/Other | 11,985 | 15,925 | +3,940 |
| Unspecified | 940 | 897 | -43 |

Source: Office of the President, Admissions, Outreach Services, University of California, September 1985, Tables on pages 5, 7.

Cal State University's studies also indicate that Hispanics have greater retention problems than other groups. One study notes that:

> After seven years, about 39 percent of the students who enter the CSU as freshman earn a degree. The graduation rates for Whites in this category are 45 percent and 24 percent for Mexican-Americans. For transfers to the CSU, after five years 47 percent graduate. The rate for Whites is 52 percent and for Mexican-Americans 42 percent (Commission on Hispanic Underrepresentation, 1985, p. 7).

Historically, ethnic studies programs were seen by the administrations as complementing the limited support services available to nontraditional minority students like Chicanos. In addition to providing academic curriculum, many Chicano Studies Programs were formed to provide counseling and other critical services to help improve enrollment and retention efforts. Hence, we find that Chicano Studies Programs have been conceived by campuses as major tools for outreach and retention; a task made difficult by the complexity of the problems of high drop out rates of Hispanics during their college education.

c. Scarce Faculty Representation

Although many colleges have adopted the concept of Chicano Studies, we still find many programs hampered by their relatively small numbers of Chicano faculty. A few studies have been completed which indicate limited faculty representation.

A 1984 survey by the Carnegie Foundation resulted in a profile of the professoriate based on 500 faculty members at 310 two-year and nonspecialized four-year colleges and universities. Table IV illustrates that the majority of nation's university professoriate is white male, with negligible representation of minority group faculty. Combining Hispanic, Mexican-American, and Puerto Rican faculty, they were only 1.2 percent of the faculty in the United States.

TABLE IV

Ethnic/Racial Composition, Gender and Rank of
Faculty in U.S. Colleges and Universities, 1985

| Faculty by Gender/Race/Ethnicity | | Academic Rank | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Male | 73.0% | Professor | 34.1% |
| Female | 27.0% | Associate Professor | 24.5% |
| White | 93.1% | Assistant Professor | 20.6% |
| Black | 2.3% | Instructor | 12.7% |
| Native Americans | 0.3% | Lecturer | 2.4% |
| Oriental (other Asian Americans) | 2.6% | Not designated Rank | 4.3% |
| Hispanics | 1.2% | Other | 1.3% |
| Other | 0.5% | | |

Source: "New Carnegie Data Show Faculty Members Uneasy About the State of Academe and Their Own Careers", The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 18, 1985, pp. 25-28.

The chief cause of the low fraction of Hispanic faculty appears to be the relatively low number who hold Ph.D. or other doctoral degrees. Although Hispanics represent about 20 percent of the California population, they earn less than 2 percent of the Ph.D. degrees within California. In Table V we show data on UC and national Ph.D. recipients between 1977-1981. Hispanics share with Native Americans the lowest doctoral recipient rates both nationally and within the U.C. system. Nationally, Hispanics received only 1.9 percent of the doctoral awards and, within the U.C. system, they received only 1.7 percent between 1977 and 1981. Admittedly, this small, pipeline of Ph.D.'s limits the availability of Chicanos for Affirmative Action and the ability to enhance the numbers and "quality" of Chicano Studies Programs.

TABLE V

Percentage of University of California and National Doctoral Degrees Awarded by Race/Ethnicity, 1977-1981

| | University of California | National[a] |
|---|---|---|
| American Indian | .3% | .6% |
| Asian | 4.1% | 3.8% |
| Black | 2.1% | 4.2% |
| Hispanic | 1.7% | 1.9% |
| White | 67.3% | 84.5% |
| Other/No Response | 24.4% | 5.0% |

[a]The national data includes U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens with permanent visas.

Source: National Research Council Summary Reports, 1977-1981 and University of California data as reported in Information Digest, 1979-1982, California Postsecondary Education Commission.

d. Negative Environment for Affirmative Action

The underrepresentation of minority faculty is also compounded by the negative attitude towards Affirmative Action Programs expressed by a large number of the professoriate in the nation's universities. Faculty responses to a 1984 survey conducted by Carnegie indicate a lack of support for Affirmative Action Programs where preferential treatment for minority or women candidates exists. As shown in Table VI the majority of the male respondents (51 percent) indicated that Affirmative Action was unfair. Nevertheless, at the same time a higher percentage (80 percent) noted that Affirmative Action had increased minority representation in their institutions. One possible explanation for the general level of satisfaction by both males and females of Affirmative Action Programs is the increased presence of White women faculty

on campuses through past Affirmative Action efforts. Although women still do not reflect a majority of the professorate, the perceived success with Affirmative Action can be attributed to the addition of women in postsecondary education.

TABLE VI

Faculty Attitudes Regarding Affirmative Action, 1985

| Attitude | Support View | |
|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female |
| Normal academic requirements should be relaxed in the appointment of minority group faculty members | 11.8% | 12.6% |
| Impact of affirmative action poses a serious strain on faculty | 16.6% | 14.9% |
| Affirmative action is unfair to white males | 51.3% | 24.1% |
| Affirmative action has increased the number of minority group members in their institution's faculty | 79.5% | 59.8% |
| Satisfaction with the results of affirmative action in their faculty | 60.4% | 52.8% |
| The same level of support and interest exists in their institution as five years ago in increasing the number of minorities and women on their faculty | 75.7% | 58.4% |

Source: "New Carnegie Data Show Faculty Members Uneasy About the State of Academe and Their Own Careers," The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 18, 1985, pp. 25-28.

Since the majority of the professoriate is White male, the overall consensus is against aggressive Affirmative Action Programs. Given the low figures for minority representation on college faculties, the negative attitude means the future efforts to develop Chicano Studies Programs will more than likely face resistance by the majority group.

## PART II. SURVEY OF CHICANO STUDIES PROGRAMS

In this part of the report we shift to our survey of Directors and faculty of Chicano Studies Programs in California and selected programs of the Southwest (including Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas). In going directly to these programs we have attempted to understand how the above constraints have affected the activities and status of Chicano Studies.

### Objectives

Our survey sought answers to the following questions:

1. How are Chicano Studies Programs structured? What is the faculty composition, level of support and faculty status?
2. Are Chicano Studies Programs and Affirmative Action considered integral parts of the campus environment? What do Chicano faculty think about Affirmative Action and Chicano Studies Programs, per se?
3. Is there a high correlation between program quality and campus Affirmative Action? Does a good program of Affirmative Action (e.g., a large number of Chicano faculty) correlate with special features of a Chicano Studies curriculum and program?
4. What are some of the current problems affecting Chicano Studies? Do these problems relate to the constraints mentioned above?
5. What are the essential elements of an "effective" or "ideal" program of Chicano Studies? What features make a difference in terms of retention and success of Chicano students and faculty?

Procedure

The method of analysis for the study involved the following steps:

1. Identification and listing of Chicano Studies Programs and faculty in four-year universities or colleges of the Southwest, i.e., California, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas;
2. An examination of the most recent campus catalogs to gather secondary information on programs and faculty;
3. A survey/questionnaire to each program director listed in our directory regarding program characteristics, such as: funding, tenure status of faculty, level of student participation and impressions on the quality of each program;
4. An assessment of programs according to several indicators like: size of faculty and level of participation of students in courses and groups; and faculty program evaluation;
5. Follow-up visits with selected campuses for in-depth interviews and discussions regarding Chicano Studies and Affirmative Action.

Program Descriptions

In the first step of our survey, we prepared a detailed directory of 38 programs of Chicano Studies[1], covering public and private four year colleges and universities, with an emphasis on California. Table VII provides a listing of the programs surveyed according to labels and campuses. Eighteen programs are in the California State University (CSU) system; eight are in the University of California (UC); five are in other private schools in California and, seven are from other states of the Southwest.

---

[1]Directory available care of Rochin and de la Torre, Chicano Studies, University of California, Davis 95616.

TABLE VII

Chicano Studies Programs, 1986[a]

| California State Universities | | University of California | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Chicano Studies | 4 | Chicano Studies Program | 3 |
| Fullerton | | Berkeley | |
| Los Angeles | | San Diego | |
| Northridge | | Santa Barbara | |
| Sacramento | | | |
| | | Chicano Studies Center | 1 |
| Chicano/Latino Studies Program | 1 | Los Angeles | |
| Fresno | | | |
| | | Mexican-American/Chicano Studies | 1 |
| Ethnic Studies Department | 1 | Davis | |
| Hayward | | | |
| | | International Chicano Studies Center | 1 |
| Ethnic Studies Program | 2 | Irvine | |
| Humboldt | | | |
| Stanislaus | | Ethnic Studies Department | 1 |
| | | Riverside | |
| Ethnic and Women Studies | 2 | | |
| Chico | | Courses Offered/No Program | 1 |
| Pomona | | Santa Cruz | |
| Mexican-American Studies | 5 | | |
| Dominguez Hills | | N=8 | |
| Long Beach | | | |
| San Diego | | | |
| San Jose | | | |
| Sonoma | | | |
| La Raza | 1 | | |
| San Francisco | | | |
| Courses Offered/No Program | 2 | | |
| San Bernardino | | | |
| San Luis Obispo | | | |
| N=18 | | | |

| Private Colleges in California | | Public Out-of-State Universities[b] | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Chicano Studies Program | 2 | Mexican American Studies Center | 2 |
| Claremont Colleges | | University of Arizona, Tucson | |
| Loyola Marymount | | University of Texas, Austin | |
| Ethnic Studies | 2 | Chicano Studies | 2 |
| Santa Clara | | University of Colorado, Boulder | |
| USC | | University of Texas, El Paso | |
| Chicano Studies Center | 1 | Courses Offered/No Program | 3 |
| Stanford | | New Mexico State, Las Cruces | |
| | | University of New Mexico | |
| | | Pan American University, Texas | |
| N=5 | | N=7 | |

[a]Not all programs are listed as Chicano Studies, per se. This table shows various designations by campus.
[b]Selected campuses of Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona.

Source: Directory of Chicano Studies Programs in California and the Southwest by de la Torre and Rochin, June 1986.

It is important to clarify that not all campuses have a "Chicano Studies Program." Of the 38 programs, only 15 identified themselves as Chicano Studies. The second major listing was for Ethnic Studies, followed by Mexican-American Studies. These labels exemplify the variety found across programs. Some campuses have a Department of Chicano Studies or a Center for Chicano Research. But in a few cases we have, for example, a Chicano Studies Division within either a Department of Ethnic Studies, or a Comparative Cultures Program, or within a combined grouping for Raza or Women's Studies. The newest and most unusual program is the one at the University of California, Irvine. Founded in 1986, it is entitled the International Program for Chicano Studies and offers undergraduate and graduate students an international scientific dimension, focusing primarily on Natural and Medical Sciences. Irvine's faculty includes professors of Ecology, Biology, Family Medicine, Biochemistry, as well as the humanities and social sciences.

Although apparent differences exist between campus programs (in terms of the labels and emphasis of each), they still have several features in common. For one, courses are largely taught by Chicano faculty members. These courses have the common characteristic of being interdisciplinary in nature, drawing materials from the diverse academic disciplines of the respective faculty members. Most courses are either "for" or "about" Chicanos in order to draw more than Chicano students. Most programs offer a major and/or minor in Chicano or Ethnic Studies. Some offer a bilingual/bicultural teaching credential while almost all have courses requiring fluency in Spanish. Almost all have a small core of faculty and/or administrators in charge of the programs and most programs list either joint or "associated" faculty who teach, advise o do research as part of the program.

Table VIII illustrates the wide range in the size of Chicano Studies Programs. Most programs have less than six faculty members. For example, Cal State Northridge is a large program which has an entire Department devoted to Chicano Studies; whereas U.C. Irvine lists many faculty who sponsor the program but do not constitute a sole department.

In general, the teaching programs service their universities and colleges by offering courses which are in the humanities and social sciences and are taught by Chicano faculty. Thus, Chicano/Ethnic Studies Programs oftentimes serve as the major source of visibility of Chicano faculty on many campuses.

Faculty Status

From the directory we also were able to list 158 faculty teaching positions. This includes 122 males and 36 females, a ratio of 3.4 Chicanos to each Chicana. Males have the highest level of tenure, i.e., 85 or 69.7 percent are associate or full professors, whereas, only 20 or 55.5 percent of the females are tenured (see Table IX). There is clearly a large gap between men and women in Chicano Studies.

Even though there is a clear underrepresentation of women in Chicano Studies, two changes are still noteworthy. First, the relatively large number of tenured faculty suggest that most of the programs are funded and staffed with regular budgets. There no longer is the problem of the early 1970s of institutionalizing programs with regular faculty and budget allocations on each campus (see Rochin, 1973). Second, given that these programs are relatively top heavy with tenured faculty, the possibility of expanding or adapting these programs to the demands of the 1980s may be limited, unless new positions are made available. Since many of the Chicano faculty on campuses were employed in ethnic studies programs, this will have a direct impact on

TABLE VIII

Faculty Size From Smallest to Largest Programs, 1986

| Faculty Size | California State University | University of California | Private | Out-of-State |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3 | 1[a] | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 3 | 0 | 1[b] | 1[a] |
| 5 | 2 | 1[a] | 0 | |
| 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | |
| 7 | 0 | 1[a] | 0 | |
| 8 | 0 | 1[a] | 1[b] | 1[a] |
| 9 | 0 | 1[a] | | |
| 10 | 0 | 1[a] | | 2[a] |
| 11 | 0 | | | |
| 12 | 0 | | | |
| 13 | 1[b] | | | |
| . | | | | |
| . | | | | |
| . | | | | |
| 19 | | 1[c] | | |
| | N=15 | N=8 | N=5 | N=7 |

[a]Refers to joint positions departments.
[b]Faculty housed in own department, i.e., Cal State Northridge.
[c]Faculty listed as program sponsors, all with appointments in traditional departments.

Source: Directory of Chicano Studies Programs in California and the Southwest by de la Torre and Rochin, Chicano Studies, University of California, Davis, June 1986.

TABLE IX

Tenure Status of Chicano Studies Faculty by Gender, 1986

| | California State University | | University of California | | Private | | Out-of-State | | Total | | Distribution[a] Male & Female |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | % |
| Lecturer | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | | 8 | 3 | 11 | 7.0 |
| Instructor | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 0.6 |
| Assistant | 5 | 1 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 2 | | | 18 | 10 | 28 | 17.7 |
| Associate | 26 | 1 | 14 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 49 | 12 | 61 | 38.6 |
| Full | 20 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | 36 | 8 | 44 | 27.9 |
| Adjunct | | | 3 | | | | | | 3 | | 3 | 1.9 |
| Visiting | | | 4 | 1 | 2 | | | | 6 | 1 | 7 | 4.4 |
| Director/ Coordinator | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1.9 |
| Total | 57 | 9 | 39 | 21 | 19 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 122 | 36 | 158 | 100.0 |

[a]Percent of total Male and Female.

Source: Directory of Chicano Studies Programs in California and the Southwest by de la Torre and Rochin, June 1986.

faculty diversity. If there is a decline in the number of positions available to ethnic studies, then Chicano faculty integration can only occur in traditional departments or in joint faculty positions.

Program Quality: Responses to a Questionnaire

We prepared a questionnaire which addressed two sets of concerns: One, what problems does your program face and two, what would be the features of an ideal program. We also asked respondents to identify the best program of Chicano Studies and why.

The questionnaire was mailed in Winter 1986 to each of the 38 campuses listed in our Directory of Chicano Studies and addressed to both program Directors and faculty members. Altogether we mailed 60 questionnaires and received responses from 38. Most respondents were current program directors of Chicano Studies.

a. Current Problems

Although we were able to conclude that about 80 percent of our sample have "established" programs, with regular positions and hard money, less than half of the respondents considered their respective programs as qualitatively sound. Indeed, 24 percent of the respondents considered their programs to be of questionable sustainability. The most common responses given for this problem were generally: (1) the campus community questions the program; (2) the need for more faculty; (3) low course enrollments; (4) the lack of money; and (5) weak faculty. On the other hand, the most common response by those respondents who evaluated their programs as qualitatively sound was the high quality of faculty in their departments.

In order to provide greater detail on the main questions asked above we resorted to listing several possible problems and asking respondents to rate

each one. We sought faculty perceptions of the most pressing problems their Chicano Studies Programs faced. Using a range between 1 and 4, where a response of "1" indicates a very important problem and a response of "4" refers to an insignificant problem, we were able to calculate a mean value of each problem from the pooled sample (see Table X).

Of the 14 problems we listed, the highest rated problem was ineffective Affirmative Action Programs on campuses (see Table XIII). This is followed by the lack of Chicanos in high administrative positions and lack of a general support from campus administrations. These responses clearly indicate that if Affirmative Action Programs are weak with respect to student and faculty hiring, retention and recruitment, Chicano Studies faculty believe that their programs will also be of questionable quality.

Problems which were given the lowest ranking by the respondents were: the geographic isolation of the campus; the high student/teaching ratio; and the lack of publication outlets for Chicano scholars. Lack of availability of Chicanos with strong academic credentials was not considered a critical problem by these respondents.

The lack of Affirmative Action hiring of Chicanos for faculty and staff positions was a major conclusion derived from this survey. Chicano respondents do not perceive the problem to be one of limited Chicano students.

b. Features of the Ideal Program

The second rank order question attempted to identify those factors which were critical for developing a "quality Chicano Studies program." In many ways these rank order questions reflect similar responses as the previous question.

TABLE X

Average Rank-Order Responses Concerning Major Problems Facing Chicano Studies Programs[a]

| Problems | Average Score[b] | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Ineffective affirmative action programs | 1.60 | .71 |
| 2. Lack of Chicanos in high administrative positions | 1.70 | .90 |
| 3. Lack of support (not financial) from the administration | 1.92 | .87 |
| 4. Lack of time for faculty due to work overload | 2.00 | 1.08 |
| 5. Limited funds or financial constraints | 2.05 | .89 |
| 6. Decline in Chicano student enrollment | 2.16 | .94 |
| 7. Established academic credibility of program | 2.21 | .98 |
| 8. Chicano student apathy and/or resentment | 2.41 | .88 |
| 9. Positive community image of Chicano faculty | 2.50 | 1.00 |
| 10. Lack of leadership within the program | 2.60 | 1.01 |
| 11. Availability of Chicanos with strong academic credentials | 2.70 | .91 |
| 12. Geographic isolation of program on campus | 2.84 | .92 |
| 13. High student/teaching ratio | 2.92 | .92 |
| 14. Lack of publication outlets for Chicano scholars | 3.03 | 2.65 |

[a]N=38, where UC respondents=8, CSU respondents=22, Private respondents=7; and Out-of-State respondents=1.
[b]Based upon item by item scoring of 1 to 4 where 1=most critical; 4=least critical for program during 1985-86.

Source: Chicano Studies Survey by Rochin and de la Torre, Spring 1986.

Again, we provided a listing of possible features as shown in Table XI. Only here, a "critical" ideal would be rated a "1" and the least critical a "4". Dividing these rank order responses into three groups, Group I, the first six responses reflecting the highest "ideals"; Group II, the second set of six responses reflecting a medium "ideal"; and Group III, the final six responses reflecting a low level of support, we can derive the following conclusions:

1. In general, Group I responses centered around Affirmative Action issues: the need for increased Chicano scholars, greater program funding; more Chicano students; and programs, such as study programs, which will assist in retaining Chicano students.
2. Group II responses centered on programmatic suggestions and emphasis, with the exception of the issue of faculty office space. However, these issues appear to be of secondary importance compared to the issue of Affirmative Action.
3. The least important fators, listed in Group III, addressed issues concerning criteria used for promotion and pay of Chicano Studies faculty. In addition, the issue of higher admission requirements was considered the least important of all variables listed.

Thus, if campuses were going to give attention to improving the role and quality of Chicano Studies, they would do well to focus their priorities on the factors identified in Group I of Table XI.

c. Other Comments on Quality

Although the majority of Chicano/Ethnic studies faculty are tenured, the range of the department/program size (as shown in Table VIII) is critical in assessing the program's ability to positively contribute to Affirmative Action

TABLE XI

Average Rank-Order Responses and the Standard Deviations Concerning the Best Way to Improve Program Quality[b]

| | Average Score[a] | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|
| Group I | | |
| 1. Better campus affirmative action | 1.45 | .64 |
| 2. More trained Chicano scholars | 1.63 | .74 |
| 3. Greater funding for the program | 1.63 | .84 |
| 4. More "activist," politically involved Chicano students | 1.70 | .77 |
| 5. Good educational services | 1.76 | .91 |
| 6. A positive public image and strong community ties | 1.79 | .69 |
| Group II | | |
| 7. Stronger Chicano mentors for students | 1.84 | 1.13 |
| 8. Solid liberal arts and interdisciplinary programs | 1.86 | .92 |
| 9. Greater research emphasis | 1.97 | .90 |
| 10. Program linked to publication or professional organization on campus | 2.05 | .94 |
| 11. Greater teaching emphasis | 2.16 | 1.35 |
| 12. Better office space and facilities for faculty | 2.22 | .99 |
| Group III | | |
| 13. Social and psychological counseling for students | 2.26 | .96 |
| 14. Strong links to Chicano professional societies | 2.32 | .95 |
| 15. Merit pay and promotion based on university/public services | 2.37 | .96 |
| 16. Greater social responsibility and community service | 2.51 | 1.62 |
| 17. Merit pay and promotion based on publications | 2.92 | 1.99 |
| 18. Higher student admission standards | 3.46 | 0.68 |

[a]Based on scoring, where 1=most important; 4=least important.
[b]N=38, where UC respondents=8, CSU respondents=22, Private respondents=7, and Out-of-State respondents=1.

Source: Chicano Studies Survey by Rochin and de la Torre, Spring 1986.

efforts of campuses. A general hypothesis is that the smaller the program, the less impact a program will have in sensitizing faculty and students to the needs and rights of Chicanos. Limited interest may be due to lack of public and campus visibility, limited participation on academic committees and in the academic senate, and less resources available to Chicano groups. In our survey, the factor of program size became linked to the success and quality of program. To show this we matched the responses from our faculty questionnaire concerning quality programs with program size. Most of the faculty surveyed selected programs with a large and diverse Chicano faculty as the best programs. Programs such as UCLA and Cal State Northridge were cited as the strongest programs with the breadth, teaching, and research effectiveness of their respective programs.

Table XII ranks the programs which were cited as the best Chicano programs in California. Northridge received the highest support from peer respondents, with over 50 percent indicating that it was the best program. Much can be said about the essential features of each Chicano Studies Program. With regard to Cal State University, Northridge, we would like to point out these features: (1) the program has a large faculty with many full-time positions in the Department; (2) students are its first priority and many educational services as well as opportunities for political and social activities on campus are offered; (3) it is a multicultural program, i.e., there are high Anglo student enrollments; and (4) the Department at Northridge has several Chicano scholars who are highly regarded in the field. With regard to UCLA, there is a relatively strong research center which publishes

TABLE XII

Rank Order of Best Chicano Studies Programs[a]

| | |
|---|---|
| California State University, Northridge | 56% |
| University of California, Los Angeles | 26% |
| University of California, Riverside | 6% |
| University of California, Berkeley | 6% |
| No Comment | 18% |

Sample Size N=38

[a]Percent total is greater than 100% due to multiple responses by some respondents.

Source: Chicano Studies Survey by Rochin and de la Torre, Spring 1986.

AZTLAN: International Journal of Chicano Studies Research;[1] an outstanding library of Chicano literature and collections of art and music; and postdoctoral research opportunities, i.e., paid fellowships offered by the center. Several doctoral dissertations on Chicanos have been produced at UCLA.

Table XIII gives the most frequent cited reasons for the selection of the "best programs": research and student orientation of program; available resources; "activist" orientation of program; and relatively large department size and instruction.

[1]The premier issue was published in November/December 1970 and dated Spring 1970. Recent problems with budgetary support have created setbacks for the Journal, which is two years behind in its released volumes.

TABLE XIII

Most Cited Reasons for Selection of Best Programs

| Reasons | Percentage Response[a] |
|---|---|
| Research | 41% |
| Student Oriented Program | 29% |
| Available Resources | 21% |
| "Activist" Program | 18% |
| Size of Department; Many tenured faculty | 18% |
| Instruction | 15% |
| Sample Size, N=38 | |

[a]Percent total is greater than 100% due to multiple responses from respondents.

Source: Chicano Studies Survey by Rochin and de la Torre, Spring 1986.

## PART IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There is a demographic transformation taking place in California which will result in California's population becoming predominantly ethnic minority. Hispanics, for example, now comprise a full one-third of the kindergarten population in the state. Minorities, overall, are expected to make up a majority of the school-age population by the next decade. If the birthrate and immigration from Mexico, Latin America, and other nations continues, California and the Southwest will soon have a majority of a minority population.

The fear is that Chicanos will fall into a system of de facto social and economic apartheid, dominated by Asians and Whites. If Chicanos do not become active participants in academic and political life, then there will be a shortage of Chicano leaders, professionals, and skilled workers. These problems are not new to educators.

Much can be done by solving the problems of Affirmative Action and Chicano Studies. The report inferred that the goal to increase minority enrollment in colleges requires a systematic program of building the image and visibility of Chicanos in higher education. Barriers to such a program, however, still exist.

Chicano Studies and Affirmative Action Programs are constrained by the limited enrollment of Chicanos in four year colleges and universities, poor retention and completion of college degrees, a relatively small number of Chicano faculty, and a general negative attitude towards Affirmative Action.

We have shown that Affirmative Action and Chicano Studies are strong complements. Both Affirmative Action Programs and Chicano Studies Programs require improvements. Success is apparent on campuses which have relatively

large numbers of Chicanos and highly regarded activities for Chicano Studies. Examples include Cal State, Northridge and UCLA.

Most problems identified by Chicano respondents appear to revolve around the perception of little support for Affirmative Action. Most Chicano Studies Programs need and want more Chicano faculty and students on their campuses. With more faculty present, the possibility of attracting (i.e., increasing enrollment) and serving (i.e., increasing retention) more Chicano students improves.

More problems are evident on campuses with relatively few resources and faculty for Chicano Studies. Smaller programs face greater problems in establishing a legitimate role for Chicano Studies. Therefore, the basis for a quality program of Chicano Studies is undercut.

Our survey identified the key components of an ideal program. Listed in descending order of importance, the ideal program would have:

1. Better campus Affirmative Action.
2. More trained (Ph.D.) Chicano scholars.
3. Greater funding for the program.
4. More "activists", politically involved Chicano students.
5. Good "educational" services.
6. A positive public image and strong community ties.

In sum, there is a need to augment the number of Chicanos (students and faculty) and the opportunities for leadership roles on the respective campuses. Without such improvements the academic environment for Chicanos will not be significantly altered.

mlr 7/11/86 MLR-15

REFERENCES

Burrola, Luis Ramon and Rivera, Jose A. "Chicano Studies Programs at the Crossroads: Alternative Futures for the 1980s." Working Paper #103, Southwest Hispanic Research Institute, Albuquerque, New Mexico (Spring 1983).

California Postsecondary Education Commission. "Director's Report April 1985." (Draft for Discussion) Sacramento, California (1985).

Chicano Coordinating Council on Higher Education. El Plan de Santa Barbara: A Chicano Plan for Higher Education. Oakland: La Causa Publications (1969).

Commission on Hispanic Underrepresentation. Hispanics and Higher Education: A CSU Imperative Final Report. Sacramento: Office of the Chancellor, The California State University (June 1985).

Corona, Bert. "Chicano Scholars and Public Issues in the United States in the Eighties." History, Culture and Society: Chicano Studies in the 1980s. Eastern Michigan University: Bilingual Press (1983).

Ford Foundation. "Minority Faculty: Expanding the Pool." Newsletter, Vol. 16, No. 4 (1 August 1985):1,6.

Himes, Judy. "Hispanic Participation in Higher Education: A Focus on Chicanos and Other Hispanics in California." A Study for the James Irvine Foundation, Princeton, New Jersey: The Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation (May 1982).

Jacobson, Robert L. "New Carnegie Data Show Faculty Members Uneasy About the State of Academe and Their Own Careers." The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 21, No. 16 (18 December 1985):1,24-28.

Lee, Valerie. "Access to Higher Education: The Experience of Blacks, Hispanics, and Low Socio-economic Status Whites." American Council on Education, Division of Policy Analysis and Research, Washington D.C. (May 1985).

McCarthy, Kevin and Valdez, R. Burciaga. Current and Future Effects of Mexican Immigration in California (Executive Summary). Santa Monica: Rand (November 1985).

Michel, Jose. "Profiles, Attitudes, and Performance of Chicanos in Higher Education." (1986) (Typewritten)

Muñoz, Jr., Carlos. "The Development of Chicano Studies, 1968-1981," in: Eugene E. Garcia, et al. (eds.) Chicano Studies: A Multidisciplinary Approach. New York: Teachers College Press (1984):5-18.

Muñoz, Jr., Carlos. "The Quest for Paradigm: The Development of Chicano Studies and Intellectuals," in: Mario Garcia, et al. (eds.) History, Culture and Society: Chicano Studies in the 1980s. New York: Bilingual Review Press (1983):19-36.

Office of the President. "Report to the Regents on Academic Affirmative Action." Presidents Office, Berkeley (January 11, 1984).

Orum, Lori S. Senior Education Policy Analyst for Raul Yzaguirre, President National Council of La Raza, "Testimony Presented to the House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee on the Reauthorization of Title I of the Higher Education Act." Washington DC (5 September 1985).

Rand Corporation. Current and Future Effects of Mexican Immigration. Santa Monica, California (November 1985), same as McCarthy and Burciaga above.

Rochin, Refugio. "The Short and Turbulent Life of Chicano Studies: A Preliminary Study of Emerging Programs and Problems." The Social Science Quarterly (March 1973):884-894.

Saldate, Marcario. "Information Lacking on Chicano Studies." MASRC Newsletter, Vol. 5, No. 1, University of Arizona, Mexican-American Studies and Research Center (Winter 1986):2,4.